IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1343 OF 2005
ALONGWITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1344 OF 2005
ALONGWITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1345 OF 2005
ALONGWITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1346 OF 2005

Sunaina Mathani ..Applicant.

V/s.

The State & Anr. ..Respondents.

Mr.R.Satyanarayanan for the Applicant.
Mr. V.B.Kondedeshmukh, APP in Appln.1343/05.
Mr.D.P.Adsule, APP in Appln.1344/05.
Mr.B.H.Mehta , APP in Appln.1345/05.
Ms.S.V.Gajare, APP in Appln.1346/05.

CORAM: SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.
DATE : 18th August, 2005.
P.C.:

1. Heard the learned advocate for the Applicant and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The applicant has prayed for quashing of proceedings relating to the complaint no.1952/S/2002,1387/S/1998,2006/S/1998 and 1953/S/2002 which are pending in the Court of learned Metropolitan Magistrate's 23rd Court Esplanade, Mumbai. In the said case, process has been issued against the applicant under section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

3. For the reasons recorded in my order dated 13th June, 2005 passed in Criminal Writ Petition No.213 of 2005 and order dated 21st June, 2005 passed in Criminal Application No.550 of 2005, the applicant has an efficacious remedy of preferring revision against the order of Magistrate issuing process. Hence, in my opinion, it would be appropriate that the applicant prefers revision before the concerned Sessions Court against the order of the Magistrate issuing process.

4. Liberty is granted to the applicant to prefer revision before the concerned Sessions Court. The learned advocate for the applicant states that the necessary revision would be preferred within a period of 3 weeks from today.

5. On the necessary revision being preferred by the applicant before the concerned Sessions Court, the concerned Sessions Court shall dispose of the same on merits after hearing necessary parties.

6. Applications are disposed of.

(V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.)